

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~13th July, 1960COCOM Document No. 3715.01/8 BCOORDINATING COMMITTEE

2 ST/D

RECORD OF DISCUSSIONONITEM 1501: COMMUNICATION, NAVIGATION, DIRECTION FINDING AND RADAR EQUIPMENT7th July, 1960

Present: Belgium (Luxembourg), Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, United Kingdom, United States.

References: COCOM Documents 3715.01/1 to 7.

1. The FRENCH Delegate referred to the statement made by the United Kingdom Delegate in the meeting held on the 23rd June (COCOM Doc. 3715.01/7) and recalled that at the request of the United Kingdom authorities a meeting had been held in Paris on the 13th May, 1960 in an endeavour to reach agreement between United Kingdom and French military experts as to the definition of Sub-items (b) and (e) of Item 1501. The discussions centred on the proposal put forward on the 25th January, 1960 by the United States Delegation (paragraph 2 of COCOM Document No. 3715.01/4) which had been accepted by all Delegations save the French. After careful study, it appeared that the text proposed by the United States Delegation was acceptable from the military point of view provided that D.M.E. equipments were excluded from the list of equipments exportable as administrative exceptions (item C. in the proposed Notes to paragraphs (b) and (e) of Item 1501). Taking into account the arguments put forward in the course of discussion, the French Delegation asked furthermore that the words "or equivalents" should be added to items A. and B. in the abovementioned Notes (VOR and ILS equipments) so as to permit the export as an administrative exception, when required, of French equipment comparable to the equipment known commercially under the heading of VOR or ILS, but having a different nomenclature. By "equivalent equipment" would be understood equipment serving the same purpose, having identical or lesser operational possibilities and not incorporating any more advanced technology.

2. The UNITED KINGDOM Delegate thanked the French Delegation, whose statement made it possible to bring to a satisfactory conclusion a question which had been held up for several months. The Delegate was able to agree to the changes proposed by the French Delegation.

3. The GERMAN Delegate agreed to the French proposal as to the addition of the words "or equivalents" to items A. and B. in the proposed Notes for paragraphs (b) and (e) of Item 1501. As for the deletion, however, of the reference to D.M.E. equipments from the list of equipments exportable as administrative exceptions, the Delegate wished to consult his Government's experts in order to find out whether they considered D.M.E. equipments to be more strategic than ILS and VOR equipments.

4. The UNITED STATES Delegate noted that as regards D.M.E. the relative situation seemed unchanged by the French statement, since the previous French objection to the Notes proposed by the United States Delegation to 1501(b) and (e) had been based on unwillingness to free D.M.E. from embargo. He stated that United States authorities believed that its proposals surrounded the export of D.M.E. with the same essential safeguards necessary to protect the security interests of the free-world as were provided for other equipment of equivalent strategic significance specified in the proposed Notes. Furthermore, the United States authorities believed the retention of D.M.E. in the proposed Notes to be necessary in order to avoid discrimination against United States equipment and in order to be consistent with the United States position with regard to the acceptance of VOR-DME by the ICAO as standard. He noted that the French Delegate had also now introduced a new element for consideration by proposing the insertion of the words "or equivalents".

5. The COMMITTEE agreed to hear on the 18th July the views of Governments regarding the latest changes proposed by the French Delegation.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~